

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/640,850	08/13/2003	Yasunori Ito	MURTP083D1	9131
- 22434	7590 11/13/2006		EXAMINER	
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP			WILKINS III, HARRY D	
P.O. BOX 702 OAKLAND,	250 CA 94612-0250		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ŕ			1742	
			DATE MAILED: 11/13/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/640,850	ITO ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Harry D. Wilkins, III	1742			
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	PATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 C</u> This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under the practice under the practice.	s action is non-final. ince except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 13 and 14 is/are pending in the appli 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 13 and 14 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>27 April 2006</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	•	• •			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•				
a) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documen 2. Certified copies of the priority documen 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicati prity documents have been receive nu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No. <u>09/392,466</u> . ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	٠, 🗀 ٥٥،٠٠٠٠				

Art Unit: 1742

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6 October 2006 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cowman (US 5,115,221) in view of Matsuoka et al (US 3,872,582) and Matsuo et al (US 4,324,702).

Cowman teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Cowman teaches (see abstract, figures and col. 6, line 4 to col. 15, line 15) a method of making a varistor (variable resistor, which genus includes a thermistor) including stacking a specified number of ceramic green sheets, cutting the stacked ceramic green sheets to obtain an element, applying a ceramic material having a higher specified resistance than the

Art Unit: 1742

ceramic green sheets entirely over the outer surface except the end parts, baking the element, and depositing conductive terminal layers on the opposing end parts.

Thus, Cowman fails to teach that the conductive terminal layers are deposited by an electrolytic plating process. In fact, Cowman is completely silent as to how the coating is formed (see col. 9, lines 39-47). Cowman assumes that one of ordinary skill in the art was well aware of how to apply the terminals.

Matsuoka et al teach (see abstract, figure and col. 5, lines 4-11) conventional methods for applying a conductive terminal on a sintered ceramic resistor element, similar to the one disclosed by Cowman. Matsuoka et al teach that the known methods included electrolytic plating.

Therefore, it would have been within the knowledge and skill of one of ordinary skill in the art to have used the conventional electrolytic plating method as disclosed by Matsuoka et al for applying the conductive terminal of Cowman because the electrolytic plating was known to be capable of forming the conductive terminals.

Further, Cowman fails to teach that the ceramic green sheet compositions were selected to achieve a ceramic thermistor element having a specific resistance lower than 200 Ω cm and comprising as principal component oxides containing two or more metals selected from the group consisting of Mn, Ni, Co, Fe, Cu and Al.

Matsuo et al teach (see abstract and col. 2, line 49 to col. 3, line 22 and col. 10, lines 32-34) that thermistors having desirable low resistance could be made from various compositions, including mixtures of Mn, Ni, Fe and Cu oxides.

Art Unit: 1742

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have made the ceramic green sheets of Cowman from the ceramic composition disclosed by Matsuo et al because Matsuo et al teach that the disclosed compositions had excellent properties as thermistor elements including low specific resistance and high B-constant. Additionally, Matsuo et al show that the specific resistance of the thermistor was a known result effective variable based upon the composition of the thermistor element. Thus, it would have been within the ability of one of ordinary skill in the art to have selected an appropriate composition for achieving a desired specific resistance of the formed thermistor.

Cowman teach (see col. 7, lines 15-64) that the ceramic layer (21) had a specific higher resistance than the ceramic green sheets in order for the varistor to function and states that the ceramic layer can either be of the same composition as the ceramic green sheets albeit with higher specific resistance or a differing composition with higher specific resistance.

Therefore, it would have been within the ability of one of ordinary skill in the art to have selected the same material for the outer ceramic layer (21) as was selected for the green sheets because Cowman teaches that such selection was appropriate as long as the ceramic layer (21) had higher resistance than the ceramic green sheets. The ceramic material of Matsuo et al had as principal components, oxides including Mn and Ni and also comprised at least one metal such as Zr or Fe.

Regarding claim 14, Cowman teaches (see col. 7, lines 31-64) that the ceramic layer and the thermistor element can be made of the same material.

Art Unit: 1742

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 13 and 14 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Harry D. Wilkins, III whose telephone number is 571-272-1251. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy V. King can be reached on 571-272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Harry D Wilkins, III Primary Examiner Art Unit 1742

hdw